

Rohrabacher resolution tomorrow which will deny Most Favored Nation status to China.

The importance of a "yes" vote tomorrow in support of the Rohrabacher resolution is to send a message to the Chinese that the kind of behavior from persecution of people practicing their religion, to closing of their markets, to human rights violations, to proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the only way to get the message that this body is unhappy and does not tolerate that kind of behavior is a "yes" vote tomorrow on the Rohrabacher resolution.

CHINA AND MFN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHERWOOD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for half the time until midnight.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks we have just heard concerning the vote that will be coming up tomorrow on Most Favored Nation status, or as it is now referred to, normal trade relations, with the Communist government of China.

Let me just say for the record that this is a bipartisan effort. As we can see tonight, some people on the other side of the aisle have been very active; some people on my side of the aisle have been very active.

Perhaps one of the greatest disappointments I have had with this administration is that during President Bush's term in office I was very disappointed in his policies toward Communist China and, in fact, after Tiananmen Square was bitterly disappointed in how we took that and the positions we were taking in response to the massacre of democracy advocates in Tiananmen Square.

When George Bush lost the election in 1992 to president elect Clinton, I thought to myself, well, at least here is someone that I will be able to work with on the issue of human rights. Unfortunately, I had bought in to President Clinton's posturing on human rights. And I might add, unfortunately, all of us who have been active in the human rights arena have been disappointed with this administration. I personally feel that this administration has been the most anti-human rights administration in my lifetime, and it certainly has undermined the tough stands made by President Reagan and President Jimmy Carter, and has even superceded George Bush in the area of human rights.

For example, in China, this President has decoupled trade negotiations with China in relationship to anything to do with human rights. The administration no longer has that as part of its negotiating position. This President person-

ally decided to make that decoupling. Had a Republican president done that, I imagine people would remember it a great deal more because there would have been a much greater fracas caused by that.

But tomorrow we will again address this issue that has been one that has gone on every year since my election to Congress, and tomorrow the House will debate legislation that has been introduced. However, it will be my legislation that will be debated. And that, of course, makes me feel a bit humble. I remember the time when I came into this body 10 years ago when I could not have dreamed of having a piece of my legislation being the focal point of a major day's work of the United States Congress. But I have introduced legislation that will disapprove of the extension of so-called normal trade relations with Communist China, which was previously known as Most Favored Nation status.

For the past 10 years, since the massacre of the democracy advocates at Tiananmen Square, and by the way, let us remember that the folks over in Beijing, the same people who have been in charge, the same gang that has been in charge, those people still deny that there was ever a massacre at Tiananmen Square of democracy advocates. But since then, the Congress has undertaken this debate every year, but there has been little change in the repression that is taking place in China.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) outlined that these are the very same arguments that we will hear tomorrow by the advocates of normal trade relations with Communist China. These are the very same arguments that have been offered year after year after year after year.

My colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), asked earlier on in his remarks what must happen for these people who come to this floor and suggest that there will be progress made on the human rights front; that there will be a liberalization; that there will be a change in their belligerency; that there will be positive steps taken and recognizable steps taken if we just engage them in this trade policy, what more does China have to do? How much longer will it be before these folks who advocate these positions with all of their heart and with all of their sincerity, how much longer will it take, how much more must China do before they admit they are wrong? They are dead wrong, and it is clear to everyone that they are wrong.

I personally could not come and advocate those policies, that I believed perhaps were right, if they had continued over a 10-year period to go in exactly the opposite direction than what my predictions were. I, in fact, would suggest that if tomorrow a revolt broke out in Tibet and that nuclear weapons were dropped by the Com-

munist Chinese Government on Tibet, annihilating hundreds of thousands, if not millions of Tibetans, we would still hear from these folks on the floor of the House of Representatives that if we just continue to engage them in this trade policy, that the policies followed by the government in Beijing are bound to liberalize and that the government in Beijing will become more civilized by their association with us.

I believe that they could murder every last Christian in China, they could murder every last Tibetan, they could commit genocide against every Muslim out in the far reaches of China, who they are also murdering, they could take every one of the 70 million member group, who are nothing more than a movement of people who believe in meditation and believe in exercise, as is consistent with Chinese tradition, they could murder every one of those people and we would still have on the floor of this House people advocating that we continue on with the same policy year after year after year after year.

Well, something is wrong. Something is wrong, and it does not take a rocket scientist to know that something is wrong. It certainly might take a rocket scientist, however, to know exactly how much damage has been done to us that we have discovered in the last year. Because in this last year we have found out that since the last vote on Most Favored Nation status with China the Communist government in Beijing has managed to get their hands on, through theft and other methods, of our most deadly weapons secrets. They now have the ability to produce miniaturized nuclear weapons. They have the ability to produce these weapons of mass destruction.

And our own companies are overseas telling them and teaching them how to upgrade their missile capacity and their missile capability so that they can more accurately target American cities with these weapons of mass destruction.

Now, it is the theory of those who advocate most-favored-nation status that the world will be a safer place if we have this trade with China. But as we can see, that not only is the world not a safer place as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has pointed out, Communist China is the source of this deadly weapons technology to Korea, to Iran, to other Third World rogue nations, but not only that, not only is the world not a safer place, the United States is not a safer place because of this. Our own country now faces the prospect of our companies who have gone over there to liberalize China and make them more pleasant, make them more consistent with the civilized values of the western world, our own companies have gone over there and they have been corrupted themselves to the point that they have

armed our worst potential enemy with weapons that could incinerate tens of millions if not hundreds of millions of American citizens.

There is something wrong with this policy. There is something dreadfully wrong. What more needs to be done before people will come on the floor of this House and will admit that that policy does not work? Year after year after year the same arguments, yet the empirical evidence suggests that they are going in the wrong direction. Making matters worse, as China has gone in the wrong direction, as China has kept up its roadblocks to the importation of American goods, kept up its high tariffs, used the surplus that it is generating by its tariffs on our goods and taking advantage of the low tariffs in exporting their goods to the United States, taking the tens of billions of dollars that they have earned and while they are using that money to modernize their weapons, to aim it at the United States, we have an administration that insists on calling Communist China, again the world's worst human rights abuser, is being called our strategic partner.

If we do not change our policy towards the world's worst human rights abuser, Americans will pay a woeful price. It will not be just the Tibetans who will be slaughtered but it will be the American people, not just losing their jobs as we have shown in this testimony before us this evening, we have shown how our ability to compete with China and the slave labor prices in China and the slave labor wages in China, our ability has been cut down as we export technology to that country. Yes, we are paying an economic price. The Tibetans are paying a price with their lives as are the Muslims in that country, as are the dissidents in that country. But if we keep up this policy, the American people will pay a woeful price for this irrational, immoral and greed-driven policy that is putting us in grave jeopardy to a country that is controlled by gangsters and despots.

The time, Mr. Speaker, has long since passed when the United States should reexamine these fundamental policies toward the Communist dictatorship that rules the mainland of China. Our commercial policies as well as our diplomatic and military policies have for the past decade worked against the interests of our people and has not, as we had hoped, increased the level of freedom enjoyed by the Chinese people. In fact, after some initial progress, China has gone in the opposite direction, as I have just described, especially since the end of the Reagan administration and the tragic national reversal that took place in Tiananmen Square.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) defines insanity as doing more of the same and expecting to get different results. Here I have been de-

scribing it tonight. The same policies are being advocated over and over again, but yet these folks ask us to believe that this time around, there are going to be different results. I do not believe there will be different results if we continue this policy with Communist China. I believe our country will just be in more jeopardy and that in the end we will reach a threshold in our economic relationship with China where it causes great economic damage to our country as well as the national security damage, which is already becoming evident. It is at the least unreasonable, perhaps, and what we are talking about at the least is irrational optimism for these people to continue advocating this position.

I think that it is up to us to advocate what we believe in, and I certainly respect people with different opinions. But the American people should pay close attention to the debate that is going on here tomorrow. We must understand that since this debate started 10 years ago, the genocide has continued in Tibet, the Chinese democracy movement was wiped out, and there has been an increasing belligerence of the guys who run—the bully boys, I say, of Beijing—toward the United States, towards Taiwan, towards the Philippines.

Now, big business falsely claims that China will be liberalizing through this commercial engagement. As I have said, there is no evidence of that. The evidence goes exactly the opposite direction. China, as we heard from the gentlewoman from California, is exporting its weapons technology to various rogue nations.

Let me just add, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, I was shocked to find out that Communist China is aiding the North Koreans in their, quote, space efforts, in their space program. North Korea has a space program? Give me a break. North Korea has a space program? Here we are shipping North Korea hundreds of millions of dollars of foreign aid, our biggest recipient in Asia, and they are spending their money on a space program in which Communist China is taking the technology that they stole from us, or was given to them by our own aerospace firms, illegally, I might add, and they are building these rockets in the name of a space program.

How many people who read this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or listen tonight on C-SPAN believe that North Korea is really developing these rockets to launch civilian satellites but are not, which we know that probably is the case, that the North Koreans, with the Chinese help, are developing missiles in order to intimidate Japan and intimidate the democratic peoples in the Pacific, and unfortunately also to intimidate the United States because many of these rockets in North Korea and in China, thanks to our own companies,

like Hughes and Loral, are now more capable of being more accurate in their targeting of American cities.

What we have in our China policy is a catastrophe, a catastrophe for the United States of America in the making. We see this with the money that the Communist Chinese have left over, and as the gentlewoman from California said, what type of normal trade relationship is it when they have barriers to our goods and high tariffs to our goods and we let them ship all of their goods into our country with very little tariff? With the surplus that they have from that, they are in Panama, they are in North Korea, they are modernizing their weapons, they are creating havoc throughout the world and they are putting the world in a position where we could have a catastrophe in which millions of lives are lost and we could face a catastrophe where the United States is put in grave danger. It is in grave danger today. We must change that policy for a number of reasons.

Let us go in now to what this means, what the policy is that we are talking about. Why is normal trade relations being proposed, then? Why do we have large financial interests who are pushing for that? If you examine what the trade is, what we have been talking about tonight, not only do we not have free trade, and the proponents will say, "Well, we're free traders." My Republican colleagues will say, "We're free traders."

Well, I am sorry that that is not free trade. We are not talking about free trade. There is no such thing as free trade when on one side of the trading partnership you have a country which permits in all of the goods imported from the other country at 3 percent tariffs and with very few restrictions and the other country, Communist China, putting barriers up and controlling who gets to come over and who gets to buy and sell in their market. You have got a controlled economy here and controlled trade on this side and relatively free and open trade over here. That is not a free trade equation. A free trade equation is when you have free trade on both sides. No, this is an equation that is a one-way free trade, one-way controlled trade equation. When you do it that way, you leave the outcome, the results, not to a free expression of the market between the countries but instead you leave it up to some gangsters who run a tyrannical regime in Beijing, you leave it to them as to what will be the results of that trade, because you have permitted them to manipulate it while leaving it somewhat open on our side.

This is not about free trade. No, it is about managed trade on the side of the Communist Chinese regime so that they can get the \$70 billion surplus and they can channel money and power in China to their clique. We are actually

strengthening the dictatorship in Communist China by going along with this nonsense that they talk about of free trade, because it is not free trade.

I personally believe in free trade. I would advocate it. It is called free trade between free people. If you do not have free trade between free people, it is a non sequitur, it does not exist, for a one-way free trade is not a free trade equation.

□ 2310

But then why are these companies here? If you take a look even to that degree of what we supposedly export to China, once you take a look at what those exports are, you know we have several think tanks in this town that have done studies of this, and I believe it was the Heritage Foundation that did the most extensive study and reported that there is almost no trade going on with China in which American products are manufactured here and sold to the people over there. That is not what is going on.

Now you are going to have a lot of people come to this floor tomorrow who will be saying, oh, we have got to take advantage of the China market, we need its jobs for the people of the United States, and we have got to make sure that we do not let other people sell their products there when we should be selling American products.

I hope people listen to those arguments because that argument is totally fallacious. What the facts are behind that argument is enough to curl your hair. What is being sold to China are not American products that are being produced in the United States and sold to the Chinese consumers. What is being sold there that makes this trade surplus on the part of the Chinese even worse is what we are selling to them are factories and technology, and we are building their industrial infrastructure so that, as my colleagues know, on our side of the equation what we are selling them is the long-term process and the long-term technology they will need to destroy us economically and militarily and in every other way. We are giving the Communist Chinese tens of billions of dollars, and in our side of the equation our people are making money not on selling commercial items to the Chinese and building their standard of living. We are selling them factories.

I come from a very heavy aerospace area, and we sell airplanes to Communist China. But what the companies do not want you to know and do not want to focus on is that the Chinese are insisting if we buy your airplanes, you got to help set up airplane building factories in our country, and over the past 10 years we have set up almost an entire infrastructure in Communist China so that they can come back and put our aerospace workers out of work.

Oh, that is only the first layer of this cake. The second layer is: What else is

there in this? What are we talking about here when these businessmen go over there and are setting up those factories? The reason they must have normal trade relations or most favored nation status, as we used to call it, is so that they will be eligible for taxpayer subsidies. Now is this free trade?

Now I heard the word "subsidy" mentioned here. I thought that I am a protectionist, that Rohrabacher and his gang are protectionists, and the other people are free traders. But where does subsidy come into the free trade equation? No, they have to have most favored nation status or normal trade relation status tomorrow, passed tomorrow, so that when a factory owner in the United States wants to close his factory, he will then be eligible if he wants to relocate it in Communist China to take advantage of slave wages over there, no unions, no freedom, no environmental controls. When he wants to do that and put our people out of work, he might need to get a loan. He might need to get a loan. Otherwise he would have to risk his own capital; and, my gosh, when you are doing that in a Communist country, that is a pretty bad risk.

Now, if you give him most favored nation status or normal trade relations, he can get a guarantee through the Export-Import Bank or any number of financial institutions that can traced right back to the American taxpayers' pocket, and they will guarantee the loan or they will subsidize the interest rate. We are subsidizing and we are encouraging American businessmen to go to Communist China and build the industrial infrastructure to put our people out of work. That is what we are voting on tomorrow.

Now we will be told that, no, we are voting on whether or not we are going to engage China or whether we are going to be able to trade with China. No, no. Let us ask. Everyone who hears that argument tomorrow, ask yourselves if this does not pass, will Americans be free too sell their goods in China? Of course they will. Americans will be able to sell their goods in China just as if they will be able to do it today.

Unfortunately, the Chinese have those roadblocks, but the difference will be if an American industrialist wants to set up a plant in China, he is going to have to do so on his own risk. He is going to have to do so using his own money rather than the taxpayers' money. That is the difference. That is what we are voting on tomorrow.

No wonder why these powerful interest groups want us to vote for most favored nation status, not normal trade relations. Of course they want to have the taxpayers pick it up, because they do not want to risk their money putting their money into a dictatorship.

You know, I will tell you something about the American people. If it was

not for the American people, there would not be any freedom on this planet. To the degree there is freedom anywhere on this planet and stability anywhere on this planet it is because guys like who went out to save Private Ryan went out and did it, because the American people believe in freedom and democracy and justice, believe in the type of honest and fair government, believe in democracy, believe in what Thomas Jefferson said, believe that rights belong to everyone.

To the degree that we have gone all over the world and we have stood firm for those principles is to the degree freedom has succeeded around the world, and the American people, the American working people, deserve to have somebody watching out for their interests. They do not deserve to have some industrialist who says, oh boy, I can be here in the United States and make my money, and that is all because of the protection of these decent hard-working American people; but I am going to take that for granted, and I am going to go over there to Communist China, and I am going to invest over there because they know over in Communist China without some kind of guarantee their government is so corrupt and so tyrannical, this can be taken away from them, and it is only because of the decency and honor of the American people that we do not have that kind of oppression and instability here in our own country.

But who are they hurting when they invest over there? And it is a slap in the face, they are investing over there, and they are using tax dollars from our own working people to guarantee those investments. Something is dreadfully wrong; something is dreadfully wrong.

Now I do not deny that there are a lot of people who probably think that they are telling the story as they honestly believe it, and I am sure they must believe it. But how much longer can it go on and keep going in the opposite direction?

We have a situation today where this, and this just happened the last 2 weeks. As my colleagues know, we have been told things are getting better in China, and now all of a sudden tens of thousands of people who are just members of sort of a quasi-religious movement that they exercise in the parks. I have seen them. And it is a yoga-type of exercise. It is with Buddhism and Taoism put together, and these people and this movement, they have now been targeted, targeted by the Communist Chinese Party, and they are being arrested by the thousands.

Now remember this. We have had people lobbying, lobbying this Congress for this upcoming vote tomorrow, telling us that we should vote for this because it is going to help the Christians, and the Chinese Communists have said one thing. They have said one thing.

Anybody can worship God in Communist China as long as you register with the state, sort of like the Nazis said to the Jews. You just have to register. Trust us, you will be okay. And now we have that same regime who Billy Graham and these others have told us we must, as my colleagues know, not deny them this trade status because it will hurt Christians, and all Christians have to do is register.

We have had our own religious leaders over there encouraging them to register, to register with the government. On my, my, my. The history in Communist China, you have seen this happen time and again where you have people who are being coaxed out into the open, and then it will followed by repression.

□ 2320

Anybody who suggests to a Christian in China or a Muslim in the far-off reaches of China to register with the government is doing a great disservice to our country and a great disservice to those people and a great disservice to the cause of human rights. Our country has to be the champion of human rights and believe in those fundamental values, or we are nothing. Those people themselves, their lives are on the line, and in terms of human rights, we have to have a standard of human rights where people can worship God without having to register and tell the government what faith they are.

What has happened now? That argument has been underscored, underscored by this attack on what we call the Falung Gong, which is this movement that is under attack, because even a religious movement based on something that is entirely Chinese in culture is being attacked and brutalized in the worst possible way.

Mr. Speaker, there is a real comparison about the days that we live in, and for those people who read history, I think it is time that we should read history about the time of what happened in Asia back in the 1920s. There was another country back in the 1920s who thought, like China, that they were racially superior to all of the others. We had a country back in the 1920s in Asia who thought that they had the right to dominate all of Asia, this huge hunk of Asia; and they felt that they had the will to rule, and they were going to create a prosperity sphere, and everything would be out of one capital and unfortunately at that time it was Tokyo.

The Japanese back in the 1920s had the same policies that we now have in Beijing. They had this image that they had history on their side and they had a right to dominate the planet. And the United States had people who wanted to trade with them. In fact, we traded. We sold them scrap metal, just like Lorel and Hughes traded them secrets for how to build their rockets.

We had lots of commerce with the Nazis. We had industrialists telling us a lot of the same things about the Nazis, the same thing about the Japanese militarists. In the 1920s and the 1930s we let it go. And the Japanese knew one thing: there was only one country in their way, and it was the United States of America. They knew that, and the Communist Chinese clique that runs that country in Beijing knows that the United States of America is all that stands between them and dominating that region, and some day, mark my words, we will see a Chinese Communist move on central Asia and Kazakhstan and that area.

We will see a move toward the north in Siberia and Manchuria. We will see a move to try to dominate the Pacific Basin. We already see that where they are trying to take these islands away from the Philippines, the Spratly Islands, and we will see a move into Southeast Asia. If we just give the Communist Chinese the idea that they can do anything and we will still give them this trade status, they can do anything and we will still call them our strategic partners, we are inviting the very worst elements in China to stay in power and to brutally maintain their control and to move forward with their plans, because we are a bunch of pansies and we are saps, that we will not even protect the interests of our own people.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is time to change that policy before it is too late. We ended up in a war with Japan. We can prevent that with China. We must support the democratic elements in China, and we must not treat China as a democratic country; and we must make our alliances with the people rather than the clique that runs that country. It is up to us. We can make history. We do not have to relive the 1920s and 1930s again.

But if we just blithely ignore reality, if we blithely ignore our country being treated in an unequal way and just ignore the fact that they are modernizing their military at our expense and that we come groveling to them with this unfair trading relationship that gives them all of the advantage and puts our own American people at a disadvantage, because who is representing their interests, the Communists that run China will not respect us. They will loathe us, they will treat us like the weak links we are, and we will pay a price. Unfortunately, we are already close to that.

So tomorrow I would hope that people pay close attention to the debate, and it will be a spirited debate; and it will determine again the policies of the United States of America, because this is still a democratic country where the rule of law and the will of the people will prevail. It is just that we have to get the people active and involved in these issues.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. GRANGER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of official business.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

Mr. EHRLICH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of the birth of his son, Drew Robert.

Mrs. CHENOWETH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MCGOVERN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. NADLER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. BERKLEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAYNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SLAUGHTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, for 5 minutes, July 27.

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KOLBE, for 5 minutes, July 27.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BRYANT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BACHUS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)